

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/055,201

Applicant(s)
Brown, W., Herchen, H., Welch, M.D.

Examiner
Rudy Zervigon

Group Art Unit
1763



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Rudy Zervigon

(3) _____

(2) Guy Tucker (415.538.1555)

(4) _____

Date of Interview Dec 2, 1999

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: Claim 1

Identification of prior art discussed:

General view of references cited.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Mr. Tucker assisted me in recalling the specifics of the case. Mr. Tucker addressed the main topic of the invention, namely the lack of protrusions from the waveguide used in effluent abatement and asked me why the consolidation of the dependent claim language into the independent claims did not place the application in condition for allowance or did not simplify the issues for appeal. I stated that the amendments could still be rejected under anticipation (102) and/or obviousness (103). I told Mr. Tucker I would review the case again and provide him with my conclusion in the following week.

Called back 12/15: The stated "core" of invention is not, surface characteristics of the effluent line, is not stressed in the specification or the claims enough.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/055,201

Applicant(s)
Brown, W., Herchen, H., Welch, M.D.

Examiner
Rudy Zervigon

Group Art Unit
1763



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Rudy Zervigon

(3) _____

(2) Guy Tucker (415.538.1555)

(4) _____

Date of Interview Dec 2, 1999

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: Claim 1

Identification of prior art discussed:

General view of references cited.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Mr. Tucker assisted me in recalling the specifics of the case. Mr. Tucker addressed the main topic of the invention, namely the lack of protrusions from the waveguide used in effluent abatement and asked me why the consolidation of the dependent claim language into the independent claims did not place the application in condition for allowance or did not simplify the issues for appeal. I stated that the amendments could still be rejected under anticipation (102) and/or obviousness (103). I told Mr. Tucker I would review the case again and provide him with my conclusion in the following week.

Called back 12/15 -> NO.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.